



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/736,938 12/16/2003		John Zimmerman	US010715A	5522	
24737	7590 06/01/2006		EXAMINER		
•	TELLECTUAL PROPE	CHANG, K	CHANG, KENT WU		
P.O. BOX 300	•				
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2629		

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Application No.		Applicant(s)				
			10/736,938		ZIMMERMAN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary		Examiner		Art Unit					
			Kent Chang		2629				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun r Reply	nication app	ears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence a	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M sisions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com- period for reply is specified above, the maximum so the to reply within the set or extended period for reply eply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DA s of 37 CFR 1.13 munication. tatutory period w y will, by statute,	ATE OF THI 86(a). In no even vill apply and will cause the applic	S COMMUNICATION t, however, may a reply be time expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONE	J. hely filed the mailing date of this of (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on							
<i>'</i> =		2b)⊠ This		n-final.					
<u> </u>		, —			secution as to th	e merits is			
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-8 and 10 is/are pending	in the applic	cation.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
-	Claim(s) <u>1-8 and 10</u> is/are rejected.								
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
· —	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or	election red	quirement.					
Applicati	on Papers								
9)□	The specification is objected to by the	ne Evaminer	•						
·				epted or b) object	ed to by the Exar	miner			
,23	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>16 December 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.05(a).								
11)	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of: 1.☐ Certified copies of the priority				-(d) or (f).				
	2. Certified copies of the priority				on No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies					l Stage			
	application from the Internation					· Olugo			
* S	see the attached detailed Office action		•	,	d.				
Attachmen	t(s)								
1) 🛛 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4	l) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (I			Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te	0.450)			
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or r No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/16/03</u> .	r PTO/SB/08)		5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/736,938

Art Unit: 2629

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted 12/16/03 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,690,387.

Claims in the current application are a broader version of claims in US Patent No.

6,690,387 with omission of the use of a keyboard coupled to the microprocessor.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from

Page 2

each other because omission of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if remaining elements perform same functions as before. <u>In re KARLSON</u> (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184 (1963).

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Yanker (US 5,075,673); Sugimoto et al (US 5,526,023); Tognazzini (US 5,850,211); Haynes (US 5,864,330); Takaike (US 6,384,845).

CONTACT INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kent Chang whose telephone number is 571-272-7667. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz, can be reached at 571-272-3638.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

571-273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window, now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kent Chang

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2629Division 2629

kc 5/28/06